UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,509	03/28/2001	Xiaofei Huang	005306.P007	5084

7590 06/26/2006

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, THANH T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2144	

DATE MAILED: 06/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/820,509	HUANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tammy T. Nguyen	2144	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *(3)* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 May 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3, 5-30* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *4* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Detailed Office Action

1. This application response to the amendment filed on May 2, 2006.

2. Claims 1-30 are pending.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claim 4 ~~are~~ is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in each of independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kloba et al., (hereinafter Kloba) U.S. Patent No. 6,839,744 in view of Britt et al., (hereinafter Britt) U.S. Patent No. 6,647,267.

6. Regarding independent claims 1 and 6, (exemplary independent claim 1), Kloba discloses the invention substantially as claimed, Kloba discloses including a method to synchronizing a computing device and a server, comprising; receiving a synchronization identifier (ID) from the server (see Kloba teaches synchronization of appointments, events and /or dates may be performed by a calendar module], [see Kloba col.5, lines 30-35 and col.9, lines 1-13]; receiving a record extraction sequence identification (ID) from the server, providing the record extraction sequence ID to the computing device (Kloba teaches sending to the client a data marker that is used in the synchronization process as a way of identifying state of data in the client), [see Kloba, Col. 18, lines 10-15]; and extracting from a database records are relevant to the computing device based on the synchronization ID and the records (Kloba teaches the data module maintains information relevant to the client , as well as information relevant to the modules contained n the server) [see Kloba col.8, lines 48-55] that have been changed since a prior synchronization if the record extraction sequence ID matches a previously obtained record extraction sequence ID, wherein the extracted records are not already stored on the computing device [see Kloba, Col. 18, lines 28-67, Col. 19, lines 3-39, Col. 20, lines 29-50]. However, Kloba does not explicitly disclose receiving a synchronization identifier (ID) from the server, the synchronization ID being a unique identifier associated with the computing device.

In the same field of endeavor, Britt discloses (e.g., a cellular transmitter for automatically providing position location and emergency data). Britt discloses the ID being a unique identifier associated with the computing device (Britt teaches the predefined personal identity information (identifier) being stored locally at the transmitter (handheld)) [see col.4, lines 49-55].

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Britt's teachings of a cellular transmitter for automatically providing position location and emergency data with the teachings of Kloba, to have the ID being a unique identifier associated with the computing device because it would have provided specific functions that automatic reporting location information over a cellular phone usefully for contacting in an emergency.

7. Regarding dependent claims 2-5 and 7-10, the limitations of these claims are taught within the figures of Kloba.
8. Claims 11-20 list all the same elements of claims 1-10, but in system form rather than method form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claims 1-10 applies equally as well to claims 11-20.
9. Claims 21-30 all the same elements of claims 1-10, but in system form rather than method form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claims 1-10 applies equally as well to claims 21-30.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filled on May 6, 2006 have been fully considered, however they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

11. Applicants argue that Kloba does not teach receiving a synchronization identifier (ID) from the server. In response to Applicant's argument, the Patent Examiner maintain the rejection because Kloba teaches receiving a synchronization identifier (ID) form the server, the synchronization ID being a unique identifier associated with the computing device as shown in col.5, lines 30-35 and col.9, lines 1-13, Kloba teaches synchronization of appointments, events and /or dates may be performed by a calendar module. Kloba clearly shows receiving a synchronization identifier (ID) from the server.

12. Applicants argue that Kloba does not receiving a record extraction sequence ID from the server. In response to Applicant's argument, the Patent Examiner maintain the rejection because Kloba receiving a record extraction sequence ID from the server as shown in Col. 18, lines 28-67, Col. 19, lines 3-39, Col. 20, lines 29-50, the client interface module executes these instructions to update the client, and saves the new data marker C3. Kloba clearly shows receiving a record extraction sequence ID from the server.

13. Therefore, the Examiner asserts that cited prior arts teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, and 26. Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17-20, 22-25, and 27-30 are also rejected at least by the virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth in the previous office action.

14. Accordingly, claims 1-30 are respectfully rejected.

15. The permission/authority to negotiate was given by examiner's Spe to discuss with the applicant's representative to amend the claimed language by providing more detail in regards what is in sections [0035, 0045, and 0046] of the specification and placing "synchronization ID stored locally on the computing device" into each of independent claim in order to place the application in the condition for futher forwards.

Conclusion

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Tammy T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3929. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ***William Vaughn*** can be reached on 571-272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TTN
June 21, 2006

WILLIAM C. VAUGHN, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER